United Nations S/PV.5608

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5608th meeting

Friday, 22 December 2006, 10.40 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Nasser	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Wang Guangya
	Congo	Mr. Ikouebe
	Denmark	Ms. Løj
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Peru	Mr. Voto-Bernales
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Slovakia	Mr. Burian
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Mahiga
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

The situation in Sierra Leone

Third report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (S/2006/922)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-67916 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Sierra Leone

Third report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (S/2006/922)

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Netherlands and Sierra Leone, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Pemagbi (Sierra Leone) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Majoor (Netherlands) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the third report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone, contained in document S/2006/922.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/2006/1012, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Greece, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1734 (2006).

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom welcomes the adoption by unanimity of resolution 1734 (2006). It widely recognizes the huge steps that Sierra Leone has taken over the past few years, and in particular over the past 12 months since the last United Nations peacekeeper left and the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL) was established under resolution 1620 (2005).

Only a few years ago, Sierra Leone was the site of Africa's most gruesome civil war. Over the past 12 months, in comparison, Sierra Leone has continued to move forward. A strategy for reforming the civil service has been finalized; judicial and security sector reform continue; the armed forces and police have increased their capacity and professionalism; refugees have returned home; and steps to improve human rights have been taken, notably through the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission.

Crucial to reconciliation and the establishment of the rule of law has been the work of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and in particular the detention and forthcoming trial in The Hague of former Liberian President Charles Taylor. That sends a clear message that there is no impunity. It also underlines the importance of a regional approach.

Over the next 12 months, the efforts of the Government of Sierra Leone, with our support, must be consolidated and continued. There is still a mountain to climb. Adult literacy stands at just 35 per cent. The probability of living until the age of 40 is only 47 per cent. There are three physicians per 100,000 people, and 50 per cent of the population suffer from undernourishment and live on less than $1 a day.

So, in the next year we see three priority areas: first, the fight against corruption; secondly, civil service reform; and thirdly, the development of clear policies and strategies, in particular to tackle youth unemployment, to tackle poverty and to generate economic development.

The year 2007 will be a milestone year for Sierra Leone. July's presidential and parliamentary elections will be crucial towards building a successful, sustainable democracy. All parties in Sierra Leone must demonstrate their full and unconditional commitment to a full democratic process. International support will be vital. To that end, the resolution temporarily increases the number of military and police advisers, to enable the Office to support the election process without having to cut back on its work elsewhere. It also calls on the Secretary-General to conduct an assessment of UNIOSIL's role closer to that election date, so that, as Sierra Leone makes a transition towards sustainable and peaceful economic development, that can be properly handled.

That process will be reinforced by the longer-term international attention and support to be provided by the inclusion of Sierra Leone, at its request, on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Security Council should work closely with the Commission to benefit from its advice as we move forward. So, the participation today of the representative of the Netherlands is very welcome, and we congratulate him on his appointment as Chair of the meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission on Sierra Leone.

I should like to highlight the particular need for further work within Sierra Leone on implementing resolution 1325 (2000). Gender inequality remains a serious problem, yet women's empowerment is central to peace consolidation and good governance. There is a particular need to ensure that women are able to participate fully in the 2007 election, both as electors and as candidates, as called for in today's resolution. A gender perspective should be taken fully into account in implementing the mandate we have agreed upon today. I look forward to the next Secretary-General reporting to the Council on an action plan agreed upon with the Government of Sierra Leone in order to implement resolution 1325 (2000).

Sierra Leone is a country close to the heart of the Secretary-General, as well as to his home in Ghana. So, it is particularly appropriate that this should be one of the last resolutions adopted by the Council during Kofi Annan's tenure as Secretary-General. From Sierra Leone to the Sudan to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Secretary-General has demonstrated a tireless commitment over the past 10 years — indeed, over his professional lifetime — to building peace and prosperity in Africa and to calling upon nations to protect those whose national Governments cannot do so. Africa and Sierra Leone are better places thanks to his efforts, and so is the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, who will address the Council in his capacity as Chair of the meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission on Sierra Leone.

Mr. Majoor (Netherlands): Upon requests by the Government of Sierra Leone and the Security Council, the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission last June selected Sierra Leone to be one of the first countries to be considered by the Peacebuilding Commission. I very much welcome this opportunity to inform the Council about the discussions undertaken in the two country-specific meetings on Sierra Leone which took place in the framework of the Peacebuilding Commission on 12 October and 13 December 2006. The Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's Organizational Committee, Ambassador Gaspar Martins of the Republic of Angola, who chaired the first country-specific meeting, has shared with the Council the Chairman's summary of the most recent meeting.

Allow me to highlight some key outcomes of our discussions both last week and during the first country-specific meeting on Sierra Leone. In Sierra Leone, important achievements have been made to date in restoring peace and stability and promoting post-conflict recovery. This was highlighted during both country-specific meetings. The Commission welcomed the efforts of the international community in supporting the Government in developing and implementing the various strategies: the poverty reduction strategy, the medium-term expenditure framework and the peace consolidation strategy. Members stressed that all peacebuilding efforts should be linked to the existing strategies under the leadership and ownership of the Government of Sierra Leone. Members and the Government of Sierra Leone agreed that specific challenges under four critical areas need to be addressed: social and youth empowerment and

employment; consolidating democracy and good governance; justice and security-sector reform; and capacity-building.

Sierra Leone was declared eligible to benefit from the Peacebuilding Fund. It is expected that a country envelope of approximately $25 million can be made available as an initial contribution. Members urged the international community to ensure an adequate level of external assistance and to lend support to the Government of Sierra Leone to broaden its donor base and secure assistance, including further debt relief. Members called on the international community to provide adequate resources and support for the upcoming presidential and parliamentary elections, including capacity-building to ensure the equal participation of women in the electoral process.

In order to bring the discussions and the activities within the country-specific meetings on Siena Leone forward in months to come, the following was decided. First, the Peacebuilding Support Office is to present a calendar of ongoing and planned peacebuilding-related activities in Sierra Leone.

Secondly, the Chair of the country-specific meeting for Sierra Leone is to develop, in consultation with members, a work plan with a clear timeline and division of responsibilities for actions to be undertaken by the Government, the United Nations system and other stakeholders in preparation for the next country-specific meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Thirdly, a follow-up meeting of the Commission on Siena Leone will be held in March 2007. It will review actions and progress in the realization of peacebuilding goals and priorities, the effectiveness of international assistance and ways to enhance that assistance.

Finally, upon the invitation of the Government of Siena Leone, members will consider the possibility of a visit to that country before the review.

In conclusion, I wish to underline three points. First, the discussions within the framework of the country-specific meetings on Sierra Leone have clearly demonstrated members' intention to use the Peacebuilding Commission to the benefit of the countries under consideration, in this case Sierra Leone.

Secondly, our most recent meeting built on the first country-specific meeting in narrowing our focus on the areas that require additional investment — financial and otherwise — to allow Sierra Leone to build a sustainable peace that can prevent it from relapsing into conflict. In this process, the Government of Sierra Leone has made a commendable effort to highlight the gaps that need to be addressed.

Thirdly, in spite of the Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific formats being a novelty without thoroughly tested working methods and procedures, it has become clear that all members, and the Government of Sierra Leone itself, engage actively in its discussions. There is an acute awareness of the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission for the countries under its consideration and of our responsibility to exploit it to the fullest. In that context, I wish to thank the members of the Security Council for their continued support for the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, including through the resolution the Council has just adopted.

It is my conviction that with the fruitful meetings that have taken place, we have laid the foundation for a comprehensive approach to post-conflict reconstruction and development in Sierra Leone. We have also laid the basis for a strong partnership between the Government of Sierra Leone and the international community. It is the deepening of that partnership in a spirit of transparency and dialogue that will help to define the Peacebuilding Commission as a useful body that can make a difference to the process of consolidating peace and development in Sierra Leone.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.5609

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5609th meeting

Friday, 22 December 2006, 11 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Nasser	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Ms. Løj
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Peru	Mr. Voto-Bernales
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	Slovakia	Mr. Burian
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mr. Brencick

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security cause by terrorist acts

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-67958 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2006/1013, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Denmark, France, Greece, Japan, Peru, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Greece, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1735 (2006).

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Qatar.

My delegation voted in favour of resolution 1735 (2006) because we are convinced of the need to combat terrorism, although we remain extremely concerned about the wording of certain preambular and operative paragraphs, in particular paragraph 32.

That paragraph refers to the appointment of the members of the Monitoring Team, despite our very pointed reservations. The resolution unjustifiably goes beyond the established United Nations rules of procedure with respect to the appointment of members of the Monitoring Team. It also goes beyond the authority and mandate of the sanctions committees and disregards the methods of dialogue, consultation and cooperation that should govern the selection of members of the Monitoring Team in a democratic, transparent and collective manner and on the basis of complete equity.

On various occasions throughout the year, we have voiced our deep concern about the professionalism of the Monitoring Team of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities. It goes without saying that certain elements enjoying a preponderant role in the Team do not display the required degree of professionalism and transparency and that some of the Team's methods harm the interests of certain States or religions. That prevents the Team from dispassionately and objectively considering issues relating to certain cultures, religions, customs and traditions. I do not believe that this serves the interests of justice and equity. On the contrary, it serves the interests and policies of certain States.

We have drawn the attention of the Monitoring Team, the Committee and the Security Council as a whole to that dangerous trend, but the Team and its Coordinator have shown no sense of urgency about improving their behaviour and acting in a more professional and objective manner. We call on the Working Group of the Al-Qaida and Taliban Committee to exercise neutrality, transparency and objectivity and to improve its working methods in order to avoid partiality, and we ask the Secretariat to take the measures necessary to remedy those shortcomings. We cannot have a situation in which an entity exceeds the mandate and principles given to a technical group.

The resolution should not serve as a precedent as regards the appointment of experts to monitoring teams created by sanctions committees. As I have said, the most elementary rules and procedures of the Security Council and the United Nations have been flouted in selecting the Monitoring Team's experts.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.5610

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5610th meeting

Friday, 22 December 2006, 11.10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Nasser	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Mr. Faaborg-Andersen
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Peru	Mr. Voto-Bernales
	Russian Federation	Mr. Leplinskiy
	Slovakia	Mr. Burian
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mr. Brencick

Agenda

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-67928 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in which she requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Booto (Democratic Republic of the Congo) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2006/1014, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by France.

I wish to draw the attention of the members also to document S/2006/892, containing a letter dated 15 November 2006 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Greece, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1736 (2006).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.5611

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5611th meeting

Friday, 22 December 2006, 12 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Nasser	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Martínez Gramuglia
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Mr. Faaborg-Andersen
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Mallikourtis
	Japan	Mr. Yamamoto
	Peru	Mr. Voto-Bernales
	Russian Federation	Mr. Demin
	Slovakia	Mr. Mlynár
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

The situation in Somalia

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-67934 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 12 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Somalia

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Somalia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mohamed (Somalia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council expresses its deep concern over the continued violence inside Somalia, in particular the recent intensified fighting between the Union of Islamic Courts and the Transitional Federal Institutions.

"The Security Council calls upon all parties to draw back from conflict, recommit to dialogue, immediately implement resolution 1725 (2006) and refrain from any actions that could provoke or perpetuate violence and violations of human rights, contribute to unnecessary tension and mistrust, endanger the ceasefire and political process or further damage the humanitarian situation.

"The Security Council reaffirms its respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and unity of Somalia.

"The Security Council reaffirms its commitment to a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the situation in Somalia through the Transitional Federal Charter, stressing the importance of broad-based and representative institutions and of an inclusive political process, as envisaged in the Transitional Federal Charter.

"The Security Council reiterates that the Transitional Federal Charter and Institutions offer the only route to achieving peace and stability in Somalia, and emphasizes the need for continued credible dialogue between the Transitional Federal Institutions and the Union of Islamic Courts. The Council therefore urges the Transitional Federal Institutions and the Union of Islamic Courts to fulfil commitments they have made, resume without delay peace talks on the basis of the agreements reached in Khartoum, adhere to agreements reached in their dialogue and establish a stable security situation inside Somalia. The Security Council welcomes all regional and international efforts to promote and encourage political dialogue between the Transitional Federal Institutions and the Union of Islamic Courts, and expresses its full support for these initiatives."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2006/59.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.5612

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5612th meeting

Saturday, 23 December 2006, 11.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Nasser	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Wang Guangya
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Ms. Løj
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Peru	Mr. Ruiz Rosas
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Slovakia	Mr. Burian
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

Non-proliferation

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-68094 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Non-proliferation

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Iran, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Islamic Republic of Iran), took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Matussek (Germany) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2006/1010, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by France, Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

I wish to draw members' attention to three letters addressed to the President of the Security Council from the representative of France, contained in documents S/2006/521, S/2006/814 and S/2006/815. I also wish to draw members' attention to a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council from the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, contained in document S/2006/985.

In addition, I wish to draw members' attention to the relevant reports of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, including those reports dated 27 February, 28 April and 31 August 2006, contained in documents S/2006/150, S/2006/270 and S/2006/702, respectively.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation will support the draft resolution before us relating to Iran's nuclear programme. We will do so because we believe that the draft, the outcome of lengthy and complex consultations, focuses on the affirmation of measures that Iran must take in order to produce confidence in its nuclear programme, formulated by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In other words, the main thrust of the draft resolution we are to adopt today is the support of the Security Council, through its authority, of the Agency's activities in that area.

It is crucial that the restrictions being introduced on cooperation with Iran apply to those areas that are the cause of the IAEA's concern. In that regard, we firmly believe that cooperation with Iran in areas and using resources that are not restricted by the draft resolution shall not be subject to the draft resolution's restrictions.

We believe that some of the draft resolution's wording could have been made clearer.

We are convinced that ways effectively to resolve the Iranian nuclear problem are to be found exclusively in the political, diplomatic and legal framework. In that context, it is important that the measures provided for in the draft resolution be taken in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter and commit no use of force. In strengthening the global non-proliferation regime for nuclear weapons, it is necessary to seek the establishment of solid regional and international security and stability.

Russia views the draft resolution as a serious message to Iran regarding the need to cooperate more actively and more openly with the IAEA to resolve the remaining concerns and questions relating to its nuclear programme. The parameters for the required cooperation have been set forth in the resolutions of the IAEA Board of Governors and supported by the Security Council.

The draft resolution clearly reaffirms that, if Iran suspends all activities relating to the enrichment and chemical reprocessing of uranium, the measures spelled out in the draft resolution will be suspended. That will make it possible to launch the negotiating process in the interests of a solid political settlement of the Iranian nuclear problem. The proposals that have been transmitted to the Iranian Government on behalf of the "six" remain valid.

We hope that Iran will correctly and most earnestly consider the contents of the draft resolution and take the measures necessary to redress the situation. Constructive steps by Tehran to comply with the draft resolution will make it possible to mitigate the urgency of the questions relating to Iran's nuclear programme.

Mr. Wolff (United States of America): Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability constitutes a grave threat and demands a clear statement from this Council. Today we are placing Iran in the small category of States under Security Council sanctions and sending it an unambiguous message that there are serious repercussions to its continued disregard of its obligations and defiance of this body.

Nearly four months ago, the Council sent an unequivocal message to Iran that it must take the steps required by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), including fully verifiable and sustained suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, research and development. That step was taken to convince Iran to relent from its confrontational course; consider the offer of a negotiated solution by the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Russia and China on 1 June 2006; and avoid further Security Council action. Regrettably, Iran continues to defy the international community by its continued enrichment activities, its refusal to comply with its obligations under Security Council resolution 1696 (2006), and the requests of the IAEA.

Today's Chapter VII draft resolution requires Iran to suspend all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, including research and development, and to stop work on all heavy water-related projects, including construction of a heavy water research reactor. That suspension is subject to IAEA verification; a report from the IAEA Director General on the status of the suspension is due to the Council within 60 days. Iran is also required to provide the IAEA the access it needs to verify suspension and resolve outstanding issues. Finally, the IAEA calls on Iran to ratify the Additional Protocol.

In order to persuade Iran to take these steps, the draft resolution imposes sanctions on elements of the Iranian regime involved in dangerous proliferation activities. It decides that Member States shall not engage in trade with Iran in three key nuclear areas — enrichment, reprocessing and heavy water projects — and it prohibits Member States from engaging in any trade with Iran that could contribute to its development of a nuclear weapon delivery system. Similarly, the draft resolution prohibits Iran from exporting a range of proliferation-sensitive technologies or related equipment.

This draft resolution prohibits any technical or financial assistance related to the transfer or use of the prohibited items to other countries; it requires States to freeze the assets of identified individuals and entities involved in Iran's proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities or the development of nuclear-weapon delivery systems, and calls on States not to allow international travel by these individuals. The IAEA is also required to stop providing technical cooperation for such activities.

The United States expects that Iran and all other United Nations Member States will immediately act under their Charter obligations to implement the requirements of this draft resolution.

This will be the second Security Council resolution under Chapter VII on Iran in response to that country's efforts to obtain a nuclear weapons capability, reflecting the gravity of this situation and the determination of the Council. We hope this draft resolution will convince Iran that the best way to ensure its security and end its international isolation is to abandon the pursuit of nuclear weapons and take steps needed to restore international confidence. In this draft resolution the Council has clearly affirmed its intention to review Iran's actions based on the IAEA report and to adopt further measures if Iran has not complied fully with its obligations.

We look forward to Iran's full, unconditional and immediate compliance with this draft resolution. Iran's cooperation would pave the way for a negotiated solution. We hope that the Iranian leadership comes to

understand that the pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability makes it less, not more, secure.

In conclusion, this draft resolution provides an important basis for action. It compels all United Nations Member States to take all measures necessary to deny Iran equipment, technology, technical assistance and financial assistance that would contribute to Iran's enrichment, reprocessing, heavy water or nuclear-weapon delivery programmes. It is clear on this and not open to interpretation. We will insist on absolute adherence to its requirements.

But adoption of this draft resolution is only a first step. In the coming weeks, we will work with the sanctions committee to ensure that this draft resolution is as effective as possible. We will also take steps under United States law to ensure that we have put in place appropriate measures against individuals and entities involved in the Iranian nuclear programme, and we will call on every other country to urgently follow suit.

Finally, if necessary, we will not hesitate to return to this body for further action if Iran fails to take steps to comply.

I thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for your efforts in helping secure this draft resolution.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Qatar.

The State of Qatar is eager for all States to comply with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). That is a matter of principle to which we are committed because we believe in the important role of the Treaty in saving humanity from destruction — and the threat of destruction will persist as long as nuclear weapons exist on Earth. For that reason, we have tirelessly appealed for a Middle East region free from all weapons of mass destruction. We have also called on nuclear-weapon States to submit their facilities to the inspection regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Further, we have never ceased our call upon States possessing nuclear stockpiles to work towards dismantling those stockpiles. Moreover, my country has supported all United Nations resolutions calling for such measures.

The State of Qatar believes that commitment to the Treaty, within the framework of the IAEA, which is the international forum for the sharing of nuclear information and technology among developed and developing countries, can encourage the safe use of nuclear technologies, help build confidence among States and promote understanding among nations.

The State of Qatar considers that Iran has the right to undertake research on nuclear technology and to use that technology and produce nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. No one can invoke articles I and II of the NPT to take away that right. But atomic concepts designed for destruction have given rise to advanced technologies that can be turned to peaceful purposes, provided that standards for safety, including the safety of nuclear reactors, are in place. Such standards would avert accidents. Great benefits can come of cooperation with the IAEA in this sphere, because the Agency is a centre for exchanging information and for establishing guidelines.

With respect to this difficult issue, Qatar has no suspicions concerning the sincerity of Iran's intentions as regards the peaceful nature of its nuclear programme. But we must not risk the potential benefits of cooperation with the IAEA in guaranteeing nuclear safety, particularly since this draft resolution would impede delivery of equipment necessary for the Iranian nuclear programme, which could have dangerous repercussions for the nuclear safety issue. That is why we appeal once again to our sisterly neighbour Iran and urge it to respond to this draft resolution. We know that the draft resolution is tough, but we are confident that there is wide scope for diplomatic cooperation, given that Iran has expressed readiness to continue to permit inspection activities under IAEA safeguards, including settling outstanding questions, so long as the issue remains within the IAEA's purview, in conformity with Iran's letter dated 27 April 2006 addressed to the Director General of the IAEA.

The Council's draft resolution also states that the measures to be enforced would be suspended to provide an opportunity for negotiations. These are issues that can be overcome, so long as we act in good faith. Iran can use its wisdom to address the situation with the rationality that is required. Our vote is prompted by our concerns over the safety of Iranian nuclear facilities.

Finally, we hope that the Council will stand united in the search for a peaceful settlement and that it will use such a settlement to limit nuclear proliferation

in other regions, in accordance with existing resolutions, in particular with respect to the Middle East region, and especially with respect to Israel, which has recently made statements concerning its nuclear deterrence capability.

For all those reasons, the State of Qatar will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/2006/1010.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Greece, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1737 (2006).

I now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): On 31 July, the Security Council adopted resolution 1696 (2006) which made mandatory the suspension required by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) of enrichment-related and reprocessing activities in Iran. The Council called upon Iran, without further delay, to take the steps required by the IAEA Board of Governors to act in accordance with the provision of the Additional Protocol and to implement all transparency measures as the IAEA may request.

The resolution set a deadline of 31 August for Iranian compliance. Iran's response was to step up its sensitive activities and offer to export the technologies it developed to other countries. The IAEA reported in November that Iran continued to provide insufficient transparency to help the Agency resolved outstanding issues and remove uncertainties.

In sum, Iran has simply thumbed its nose at the Council and defied international law. Bearing in mind the Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and in this regard taking with utmost seriousness the threat from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the Council unequivocally expressed its intention in resolution 1696 (2006) to adopt measures under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations in the event of Iranian non-compliance.

And that is what we have done today. We have adopted resolution 1737 (2006) under Chapter VII of the Charter, and in this we reiterate and expand the Council's mandatory suspension of Iran's proliferation-sensitive activities. We have also established an embargo aimed at preventing Iran from importing the items and material that will sustain its proliferation-sensitive activities.

In addition to taking steps to inhibit Iran's proliferation-sensitive activities, the Council has introduced a set of measures intended to persuade Iran to stop pursuing activities of concern. This resolution underlines the seriousness of the situation, including the international community's lack of confidence about the direction of Iran's policies.

But, importantly, the door is not closed for Iran. The United Kingdom, France and Germany, with the European Union High Representative, Javier Solana, have led negotiations with Iran. We remain committed to seeking a diplomatic, negotiated solution with Iran, based on cooperation. A new relationship between the European Union and Iran is on the table, but it must be with an Iran which eschews nuclear weapons.

In resolution 1737 (2006), the Council makes clear that Iran's suspension of enrichment and reprocessing activities will permit negotiations to resume and intensify, this time with the United States, Russia and China engaged alongside France, Germany and the United Kingdom.

For this reason, in the pursuit of a negotiated agreement to resolve the situation, it is vital that all States implement the resolution as fully and comprehensively as possible. This means taking immediate action, including by adopting the necessary legislation to pave the way for rapid and robust implementation. Without that, we cannot expect the Council to be able to meet its objectives.

In the event that Iran does not change course, the Council has committed itself in this resolution to the adoption of further measures. Iran, therefore, faces a choice. The vote today illustrates the gravity of that

choice and the seriousness with which we, as a Council, view Iran's behaviour.

We hope Iran will heed the decision of the Council and return to negotiation to resolve the nuclear dossier. This, in turn, would open the way for the European Union and Iran to develop a new and wider relationship to our mutual benefit and to the benefit of international peace and security.

Mr. De La Sablière (France) (*spoke in French*): France welcomes the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of today's resolution taking measures with regard to Iran under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

This resolution, adopted on the basis of a draft presented by Germany, the United Kingdom and France, confirms the mandatory nature of the suspension of sensitive activities in the nuclear field, which are of concern to the international community, because they do not have a credible civilian application in Iran today. These include enrichment, reprocessing, the manufacture of heavy water and the construction in Arak of a reactor moderated by heavy water capable of producing plutonium of military grade quality.

The resolution also allows the international community to make sure that Iran will not benefit from external contributions, under any form whatsoever, for its sensitive nuclear activities, as well as for its missile programmes. The export by Iran of sensitive technology is also prohibited, as are services, including financial services, surrounding sensitive transactions to or from Iran. The travel of those with operational involvement in the programmes will be restricted, and their assets outside of Iran will be frozen, as will the entities involved in sensitive programmes on behalf of which they operate. These measures will also apply immediately to some 20 persons and entities directly listed in the Annex to the resolution. Lastly, the resolution reinforces the powers of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in its verification work.

The aim of these measures, which is recalled in the preamble to the resolution, is to invite Iran to conform to its commitments within the framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to the demands of the Security Council and the IAEA, to persuade it to conform to resolution 1696 (2006) and to stop the development of its sensitive technology supporting its nuclear and missile programmes.

These sanctions are proportionate and reversible. The Security Council states, without ambiguity, that if Iran re-establishes the suspension of all its enrichment and reprocessing activities, including research and development, the measures that the Council has just adopted will be suspended. If it conforms to all provisions of resolution 1696 (2006) and 1733 (2006), as well as those of the resolutions of the IAEA Board of Governors, these sanctions will be lifted; but if it persists on its current path, there will be other measures under Article 41 of Chapter VII.

This resolution sends out a clear message on the part of the international community to Iran, which is now facing a strategic choice, which was recalled by President Jacques Chirac on 12 December: cooperation with the international community or growing isolation. We hope that Tehran will choose dialogue and that it will take decisions that will allow for a resumption of negotiations based on resolutions 1696 (2006) and 1733 (2006). France, with its partners, remains ready for this at all times.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): It is a matter of great regret that the Council has been compelled to act in this Chamber on another resolution regarding Iran's nuclear issue only five months after adopting resolution 1696 (2006). Over the course of this year, we have had intensive discussions on the Iranian nuclear issue in the Council as concerted international efforts continued for the purpose of seeking a peaceful and diplomatic resolution of this problem by the States concerned, including my own. These efforts, however, have failed to produce positive results.

In defiance of resolution 1696 (2006), Iran has refused to take any steps required of it to comply with the measures set out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Security Council, including the suspension of enrichment- and reprocessing-related activities. On the contrary, the situation has worsened, with Iran's expansion of its enrichment- and reprocessing-related activities.

Japan attaches great importance to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as an issue that can affect its own national peace and security and that of the international community. Proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, along with their means of delivery, is a clear and present global

challenge posing a great threat and must be handled with firm determination. It is our strong belief that, in order to counter such a threat, actual or potential, the international community must act appropriately, resolutely and in a timely manner wherever it occurs, be it in the Middle East, North-East Asia or elsewhere in the world. We believe that Iran's case, where it has failed to comply with the requirements set out by the IAEA and the Security Council, must be dealt with based on the basis of a principled stand.

At the same time, the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy by all States is also important and must be fully respected and protected. Iran has that right, just as much as any other country. We hope and expect that, in the exercise of that right, Iran will fully comply with its international obligations and give its utmost cooperation to the IAEA so that it will be able to enjoy fully the fruits of the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Because of the importance of non-proliferation, and taking into account the measured approach in the text, Japan voted in favour of the resolution. However, this resolution does not mean the end of the negotiations on the issue. The resolution keeps the door open for negotiations with Iran and explicitly mentions the reversibility of the measures that it introduces.

Japan enjoys the right to the peaceful of use of nuclear energy to the fullest in full compliance with its international obligations. We are a country that traditionally has enjoyed good, important relations with Iran. In adopting this resolution, we earnestly hope and appeal to Iran that it will seek to resolve this issue at the earliest possible time through diplomatic negotiations in full respect of its international obligations. That ought not to be impossible. To that end, Japan will continue to contribute to the efforts to resolve the issue through bilateral negotiations with Iran and other diplomatic channels.

Mr. Wang Guangya (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Since the beginning of this year, Iran's nuclear issue has attracted more and more attention in the world. Regrettably and disappointingly, Iran has yet to respond positively to the requirements of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Security Council and show flexibility on the suspension of enrichment-related activities.

After issuing a presidential statement (S/PRST/2005/15) in March and adopting resolution 1696 (2006) in July on Iran's nuclear issue, the Security Council has today adopted another resolution, aiming at safeguarding the international nuclear non-proliferation mechanism, reinforcing the IAEA's authority and role, and promoting diplomatic efforts to seek peaceful solutions to Iran's nuclear issue. The Chinese delegation has therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution before us.

China wishes to emphasize that sanctions are not the end, but are a means to urge Iran to resume negotiations. The sanction measures adopted by the Security Council this time are limited and reversible, and they target proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities and the development of nuclear-weapon delivery systems. There are also explicit provisions indicating that if Iran suspends its enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, complies with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and meets the requirements of the IAEA, the Security Council would suspend and even terminate the sanction measures.

The Security Council cannot handle Iran's nuclear issue single-handedly. The IAEA remains the principal mechanism for dealing with this issue. Dialogue and negotiations are the fundamental, indeed the only, way out. The solution to Iran's nuclear issue requires all-around diplomatic efforts.

Diplomatic efforts outside the Security Council in particular should be strengthened. The resolution welcomes the commitment of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States to a negotiated solution to this issue, and encourages Iran to engage with those six countries' proposals for a long-term comprehensive agreement. Such an accord would allow for the development of relations and cooperation with Iran based on mutual respect and the establishment of international confidence in the peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. All these aspects would be conducive to reactivating a new round of diplomatic efforts.

All along, China has supported safeguarding the international nuclear non-proliferation mechanism and opposed the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We do not wish to see new turbulence in the Middle East. We are in favour of a peaceful solution to Iran's nuclear issue through political and diplomatic efforts and negotiations.

Under the current circumstances, we wish to call upon all the parties concerned to adopt a highly responsible and constructive attitude, remain calm,

practice restraint, and refrain from taking any steps that would harm diplomatic efforts and lead to a deterioration of the situation. At the same time, we hope that the parties will seek to resume negotiations in a creative and forward-looking manner and continue to spare no effort in seeking to enhance diplomatic endeavours in favour of the comprehensive and peaceful solution of Iran's nuclear issue.

China is ready to continue to work jointly with all the parties concerned and contribute to maintaining international and regional peace and stability, safeguarding and consolidating the international non-proliferation mechanism, and resolving Iran's nuclear issue through political and diplomatic efforts.

Mr. Manongi (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania voted in favour of the resolution we have just adopted. We voted thus while regretting the fruitless outcome of the diplomatic efforts made to engage the Islamic Republic of Iran and ensure its pursuit of the peaceful uses of nuclear activities. We have stated on many occasions that, as a matter of principle, the United Republic of Tanzania is opposed to the development or possession of nuclear weapons by any party, including our traditional friends.

We are therefore opposed to nuclear proliferation and strongly support the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the non-proliferation regime it establishes under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), of which we are a member. We expect all IAEA members, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, to uphold the obligations set forth in the Treaty.

The United Republic of Tanzania firmly believes in the right of the people of Iran to civilian nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The current resolution does not in any way seek to constrain that right. It should be made clear, however, that any such programme has to be subjected to a verifiable inspection regime and the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. In our view, the provisions of the resolution should also not constrain other legal and commercial transactions that have no bearing on non-proliferation.

The United Republic of Tanzania had hoped all along that the relevant parties would utilize available avenues to resolve the highly sensitive Iranian nuclear issue peacefully through negotiations. We place faith in the capacity of the parties to build on the positive aspects of the dialogue and to return to the negotiations under mutually acceptable terms. Unfortunately, progress has been painfully slow due to the uncompromising positions pursued by both sides. Despite tremendous efforts to overcome the differences, the situation has remained deadlocked, mainly over the issue of enrichment and reprocessing activities as a condition for further negotiations. We believe that this issue can still be overcome by the negotiators.

The United Republic of Tanzania voted in favour of the resolution because we believe that the impasse is reversible if good political will prevails among all the parties involved in the discussions. The resolution is to be taken as a signal and a call to revisit the issue at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Mayoral (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I should like to state that Argentina voted in favour of resolution 1737 (2006), just adopted, because the resolution reaffirms the inalienable right enjoyed by all States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons under articles I and II of the Treaty to develop, research, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

At the same time, on behalf of my Government, I express our confidence that the Government of Iran will in the future pursue its nuclear programme exclusively for peaceful purposes, following the parameters established by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. Moreover, on a different point, we note our satisfaction that the resolution was adopted unanimously and under article 41 of the United Nations Charter. In other words, there is no possibility under resolution 1737 (2006) of recourse to the use of force.

We would point out that the peaceful settlement of international conflicts should be the United Nations main objective. To that end, its principal aim should be to maintain international peace and security, and that is Argentina's understanding in this instance. We therefore issue a new call to all parties involved to resume dialogue in order to find a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear issue.

Mr. Zarif (Islamic Republic of Iran): Today is a sad day for the non-proliferation regime. Only a few days ago, the Prime Minister of the Israeli regime boasted about his regime's nuclear weapons, but

instead of even raising an eyebrow, let alone addressing that serious threat to international peace and security and to the non-proliferation regime, the Security Council is imposing sanctions on a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) that, unlike Israel, has never attacked or threatened to use force against any Member of the United Nations; has categorically rejected the development, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons on ideological and strategic grounds; was prepared to provide guarantees that it would never withdraw from the NPT; has placed all its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); fully implemented the Additional Protocol for over two years, and stated its readiness to resume its implementation; allowed over 2,000 person days of IAEA scrutiny of all its related and unrelated facilities, resulting in repeated statements by the Agency on the absence of any evidence of diversion; voluntarily suspended its lawful enrichment activities for over two years, as verified by the IAEA, in order to build confidence and provide ample opportunity to find a mutually acceptable solution, if that ever were the intention of its negotiating partners; presented various far-reaching proposals to ensure permanent non-diversion; and has consistently called for time-bound and unconditional negotiations to find a mutually acceptable solution — a call that was repeated yesterday by the Iranian Foreign Minister.

The same Governments that have pushed this Council to take groundless punitive measures against Iran's peaceful nuclear programme have systematically prevented the Council from taking any action to nudge the Israeli regime towards submitting itself to the rules governing the nuclear non-proliferation regime. By so doing, they have provided it with wide latitude and even encouragement to indulge freely in the clandestine development and unlawful possession of nuclear weapons, and even in public boasting about them with impunity.

As I pointed out in my letter of 20 December 2006 addressed to you, Mr. President, it is indisputable that nuclear weapons in the hands of an Israeli regime with an unparalleled record of non-compliance with Security Council resolutions — if that is the criteria that is being applied today — and a long and dark catalogue of crimes and atrocities, such as occupation, aggression, militarism, State terrorism, crimes against humanity and even apartheid, pose a uniquely grave threat to regional and international peace and security. The reversal of the hypocritical policy of strategic ambiguity followed by the Israeli regime has removed any excuse — if there ever were any — for continued inaction by the Council in the face of that actual threat to international peace and security.

The reaction of the Security Council to the Israeli regime's unlawful possession of nuclear weapons will show whether the Council is even considering to act — as it is obliged to do under Article 24 of the Charter — on behalf of the members of the international community that have made their views on that issue abundantly clear, or whether it is merely a tool in the toolbox of a few of its permanent members, which only misuse it to fix their foreign policy problems and to serve their short-sighted perceived interests.

With such tendencies, it is not at all surprising that a nation is being punished for exercising its inalienable rights, primarily at the behest of a dangerous regime with aggression and war crimes as its signature brand of behaviour, which is apparently being rewarded today for having clandestinely developed and unlawfully possessed nuclear weapons. Does anyone expect that to enhance the credibility of the Council or to strengthen the authority of the NPT?

Put into perspective, today's resolution can only remind the Iranian people of the historic injustices that this Security Council has done to them over the past six decades. It is reminiscent of the attempt made in the Council to punish the Iranian people for their nationalization of their oil industry, claimed to present a threat to peace. It is also a reminder of the Council's indifference in the face of a military coup, organized by two of its permanent members, which restored the dictatorship. It refreshes the memory of the Iranian people of the time when the Council did not consider the massive invasion of Iran by the former Iraqi regime as a threat to international peace and security, and refused to even call on the invading army to withdraw from Iranian territory. It brings back the horrors of the long years when this Council turned a blind eye to the extensive and brutal use of chemical weapons against Iranian civilians and soldiers and, by so doing, made itself responsible for the tens of thousands of Iranians who continue to suffer and perish as a result of chemical weapons whose components, incidentally, came from certain countries permanently seated in this Council. We do not need to go far to find those victims. Only last month, I lost one of my brightest colleagues

in the mission, Mahdi Vahidi, to cancer caused by those very chemical weapons. He was only 39 years old.

I dealt with the pretexts used for the involvement of the Security Council in Iran's peaceful nuclear programme in my statement before the Council on 30 July. I will not repeat them today. Allow me to simply make a few points.

The bringing of Iran's peaceful nuclear programme to the Council by a few of its permanent members, particularly the United States, is not aimed at seeking, nor will it help to find, a solution or at encouraging negotiations. Even their stated objective is not to achieve that. Their stated objective has always been to use the Council as an instrument of pressure and intimidation to compel Iran to abandon its rights. Knowing their bright recent history, we can all assume what the unstated objective has been. Allow me to provide just two examples of the stated objective.

An informal paper entitled "Options for Addressing Iran's Nuclear Programme at the United Nations Security Council", circulated by the United States mission in October 2004 — exactly when the United States three European Union (EU) allies were ostensibly engaged in negotiations with Iran — states:

> "The United States has long believed that Iran's nuclear activities must be reported to the United Nations Security Council ... The United Nations Security Council has the legal authority to require Iran to stop its enrichment programme."

That was the intention. As to our negotiating partners, the Political Director of the British Foreign Office, in a letter dated 16 March 2006 addressed to his counterparts in France, Germany and the United States, revealed the more conniving British plan:

> "We may also need to remove one of the Iranian arguments that the suspension called for is 'voluntary'. We could do [that] by making the voluntary suspension a mandatory requirement to the Security Council."

The letter gets even more interesting as we read on:

> "I agreed to circulate a short paper which we might use as a sort of speaking note with the Russians and Chinese. Implicit in the paper is a recognition that we are not going to bring the Russians and Chinese to accept significant sanctions over the coming months, certainly not without further efforts to bring the Iranians around ... In return for the Russians and Chinese agreeing to [a Chapter VII resolution], we would then want to put together a package that could be presented to the Iranians as a new proposal."

Now we see what motivated the presentation of the infamous package of incentives presented to Iran on 6 June 2006, and now we see why the United States and its EU three partners never even took the trouble to study various Iranian proposals. They were from the very beginning bent on abusing this Council and the threat of referral and sanctions as an instrument of pressure to compel Iran to abandon the exercise of its NPT-guaranteed right to peaceful nuclear technology. It is now an open secret that their sole objective in the negotiations has always been to impose and then prolong and perpetuate the suspension of Iran's rights, in line with their arbitrary and fluctuating red lines. Finding solutions has never even been among the objectives.

Suspension is not a solution. It is at best a temporary — one might call it a stop-gap — measure to allow time to find a real solution. Such a suspension was in place for over two years and, contrary to the excuse that the proponents of the resolution have presented here and there, the IAEA repeatedly verified that Iran fully suspended what it had agreed to suspend in each and every report from November 2003 to February 2006. So, we had a suspension for two years and on-and-off negotiations for three. The question is: What has been done during those three years to find an agreement?

Have the EU three or the United States presented any proposal on what measures — short of outright revision of the NPT — would remove their so-called proliferation concerns? Having failed to do so, did they ever consider the far-reaching proposals that were offered by Iran in Paris on 23 March, 2005, which the EU three negotiators initially considered to contain positive elements? Did they ever propose how those positive elements could be enhanced or how the points of divergence could be bridged? Or did they, after consultations with a certain absent party, come back and simply say "It is not good enough. Continue to suspend"? Did they even bother to read our proposal of 18 July 2005, which suggested:

> "Allow the Agency to develop an optimized arrangement on numbers, monitoring mechanism and other specifics for an initial limited operation at Natanz, which would address our needs and allay [their] concerns"?

Did they ponder the far-reaching non-proliferation potential of the proposal by the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran in his address to the General Assembly on 17 September 2005? Let me refresh the memory of Council members. On that occasion, he said,

> "in order to provide the greatest degree of transparency, the Islamic Republic of Iran is prepared to engage in serious partnerships with the private and public sectors of other countries in the implementation of a uranium enrichment programme in Iran". (*A/60/PV.10, p. 8*)

Did they respond to the concrete proposal by the Iranian Foreign Minster at the Conference on Disarmament on 30 March 2006? Allow me to quote what he said.

> "In our view, one option to resolve the issue could be the establishment of regional consortia on fuel cycle development with the participation of regional countries . . . Of course, countries outside the region may also participate in such regional arrangements . . . The facility would also be jointly owned by the sharing countries, and the work could be divided based on the expertise of the participants." (*CD/PV.1015, pp. 6-7*)

Were these suggestions not an exact replica of the main proposal of the IAEA experts on multinational approaches to nuclear fuel cycle activities published on 22 February 2005? For those members who may have not seen the report, it suggests

> "promoting voluntary conversion of existing facilities to [multilateral nuclear approaches (MNAs)], and pursuing them as confidence-building measures, with the participation of NPT non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon States, and non-NPT States . . . [and] creating, through voluntary agreements and contracts, multinational, and in particular regional, MNAs for new facilities based on joint ownership, drawing rights or co-management for front-end and back-end nuclear facilities, such as uranium enrichment".

Did the Iranian readiness to implement these ideas almost verbatim not present a unique opportunity to create a global model to strengthen the NPT and remove concerns about fuel cycle activities based on the recommendation of the best international experts brought together by the IAEA for this exact purpose? Was any other country with similar technology prepared to be as flexible as Iran? Did the United States and its European allies seriously consider our detailed reply of 22 August 2006, which, unlike their practice, provided a point-by-point reply to their 6 June package and made genuine proposals to address its shortcomings? All I know is that they even refused to refer to it in the present resolution.

Did they discuss the offer of an international consortium which was presented by Iran in the course of the September and October 2006 negotiations in Vienna and Berlin and was initially considered very promising, leading to public statements of progress after those meetings — a prognosis that was rapidly and astonishingly reversed even before the ministerial meeting of the five-plus-one?

Many other similar questions may be asked. But the answer to all of them will be the same, because what the United States, and apparently the EU-3 — in spite of what they told us during the negotiations — wanted, and the only outcome that they were and are ready to accept from these so-called negotiations, was — and still is — that Iran should "make a binding commitment not to pursue fuel cycle activities", as it is phrased in package proposed by the EU-3, of August 2005.

We are here because we did not accept that unlawful demand, which, as many here already know, would not have been their last demand. At the same time, we were prepared to go to any length to allay their so-called proliferation concerns, in spite of the fact that we all know that these are no more than sheer unfounded and self-serving excuses. Indeed, old-hand proliferators and suppliers of chemical weapons and nuclear weapon technology can hardly have proliferation concerns.

The sponsors tell you that they do not trust our intentions. But the problem is that their "intentionometer" has a rather abysmal record of chronic malfunction. Suffice it to say that the former United States Director of Central Intelligence, Robert Gates, in testimony before Congress in March 1992,

claimed that Iran was trying to acquire a nuclear weapons capability and added that this goal was unlikely to be achieved before the year 2000 — seven years ago. Later, in November of the same year, a draft National Intelligence Estimate by the same Central Intelligence Agency concluded that Iran was making progress on a nuclear arms programme and could develop a nuclear weapon by 2000 — seven years ago. Now, the same intelligence establishment is saying, not before 2015.

Accusing Iran of having "the intention" of acquiring nuclear weapons has, since the early 1980s, been a tool used to deprive Iran of any nuclear technology, even a light water reactor or fuel for the American-built research reactor. I wonder which "Iranian intention" or which "proliferation concern" has prompted the main proponents of today's resolution to prevent Iran, for the past 27 years, from even acquiring civilian aircraft — or even spare parts for the civilian aircraft they sold to Iran, thereby jeopardizing the lives and safety of Iranian civilians, whom they hypocritically try to court these days — and, I might add, to no avail.

As IAEA Director General ElBaradei recently said,

> "A lot of what you see about Iran right now is assessment of intentions ... But one of the lessons we learned from Iraq is that we really need to be very, very careful coming to conclusions, because these issues make the difference between war and peace".

As we are talking about intentions, while the main proponents of the resolution may have self-servingly claimed that they doubt ours, they themselves have said and done plenty so that no body in Iran or elsewhere in the world could have any illusions about theirs: one need only read the recent dangerously divisive statement by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Or take a look at the 23 August report by the staff of the Intelligence Committee of the United States House of Representatives on Iran's nuclear programme. That report was so dangerously misleading and so illustrative of the extent to which some war-mongers are prepared to go that it compelled the IAEA to officially dispute its allegations against Iran. In its letter, the IAEA called parts of the report "outrageous and dishonest" and containing "incorrect and misleading assertions", and it offered evidence to refute the report's central claims. The Agency stressed that the report even seriously distorted IAEA findings on Iran's nuclear activities.

Let me conclude by reiterating that the Islamic Republic of Iran firmly believes that the days of weapons of mass murder have long passed, that these inhumane instruments of indiscriminate slaughter have not brought about internal stability or external security for anyone and that they will not be able to do so in the future.

Unlike some who despise the NPT and international law in general, we have a high stake in preserving, fully implementing, strengthening and universalizing the NPT. Today's decision does exactly the opposite; That should be no surprise because it was championed by a non-member of the NPT, coupled with its main benefactor, which made no secret of its contempt for this and other disarmament instruments. None of us has forgotten last year's World Summit when even the word "disarmament" was removed by the famous "red pen".

By the same token, we believe that the days of bullying, pressure and intimidation by some nuclear weapon holders are long gone. We are told that we need to build confidence. Indeed, we all do in this tumultuous world. But confidence can only be built through respect for and the non-discriminatory application of the law. Those are the only objective criteria. Anything else would be to accept the whims of the powerful. International law and international treaties cannot be the subject of arbitrary, fluctuating and self-serving reinterpretations, readjustments or red lines even if they are connivingly imposed through resolutions. Such a precedent is dangerous for everyone.

The Security Council would go a long way in addressing its own confidence deficit by truly acting on behalf of the United Nations membership, as mandated by Article 24 of the Charter. Nearly two thirds of them are members of the Non-Aligned Movement or the Organization of Islamic Conference which, at the summit level, have reaffirmed that "States' choices and decisions in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear technology and its fuel cycle policies must be respected", and have "expressed concern over ... threats and pressures on Iran by certain circles to renounce its inalienable right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes". They have also clarified where

the real threat to international peace and security does in fact lie, by, again at the summit level, "expressing grave concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel, which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States".

That is the real issue that States Members of the United Nations expected the Security Council to be seized of.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.5613

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5613th meeting

Saturday, 23 December 2006, 12.40 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Bader	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Wang Guangya
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Ms. Løj
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Peru	Mr. Ruiz Rosas
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Slovakia	Mr. Burian
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-68106 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 12.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2006/1023, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Greece, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1738 (2006).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.5614

Security Council

Sixty-first year

Provisional

5614th meeting

Tuesday, 26 December 2006, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Al-Bader	(Qatar)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Congo	Mr. Gayama
	Denmark	Mr. Faaborg-Andersen
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Ghana	Nana Effah-Apenteng
	Greece	Mr. Mallikourtis
	Japan	Mr. Shinyo
	Peru	Mr. Doig
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	Slovakia	Mr. Bartho
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Pierce
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Mahiga
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

The situation in Somalia

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

06-68299 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Somalia

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Somalia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mohamed (Somalia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. François Lonseny Fall, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Fall to take a seat at the Council table.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. François Lonseny Fall, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and head of the United Nations Political Office for Somalia, to whom I give the floor.

Mr. Fall: Since my last briefing to the Security Council in November, the crisis in Somalia has escalated dangerously as the hostilities between the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) have now expanded across a 400-kilometre-wide front. The conflict now involves foreign forces and the use of heavy weapons and aircraft. The deteriorating situation in Somalia has no doubt dealt a serious blow to efforts aimed at the early resumption of peace talks. The fighting has also compounded an already serious humanitarian crisis resulting in additional displacement of populations.

On 6 December, 2006, the Security Council adopted resolution 1725 (2006), modifying the arms embargo and authorizing the establishment of a joint Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)/African Union force to protect the Transitional Federal Government in Baidoa. The adoption of the resolution was warmly welcomed by the Transitional Federal Government but rejected by the Union of Islamic Courts, which claimed that it could lead to fighting in the region, adding that the deployment of foreign forces in Somalia was tantamount to an invasion of the country. In any event, neither IGAD nor the African Union has identified potential troop contributors or possible sources of funding for the IGAD Peace Support Mission in Somalia, as authorized by resolution 1725 (2006).

In the days and weeks leading up to the adoption of resolution 1725 (2006), there had been a gradual escalation in war rhetoric and tensions between the two sides. As a result, on 7 December, intermittent clashes began between militiamen loyal to the Islamic Courts and the Transitional Federal Government forces in various locations in the Bay administrative region south of Baidoa. At the same time, the Union of Islamic Courts accused Ethiopia of illegally deploying troops to Somalia in support of the Transitional Federal Government.

On 12 December, Yusuf Mohamed Siyad Indhaade, the Defence Secretary of the Union of Islamic Courts, announced that Ethiopia had seven days to withdraw its forces from Somalia or face a major conflict. On 20 December, heavy fighting broke out in the Bay region and soon spread to the central Galkayo, Hiran and Middle Shabelle administrative regions, where the forces of the Union of Islamic Courts had been confronting those of the warlords of the former Alliance for the Restoration of Peace and Counter-terrorism.

After several days of intense fighting, the Transitional Federal Government forces and their allies have taken control of several areas from the Union of Islamic Courts, including the towns of Bandiradley in Galkayo, Beletweyne in Hiran, Bulo-barde in Middle Shebelle, and Burhakaba and Dinsor in the Bay region. According to reports, Transitional Federal Government forces and their allies are now heading towards Jowhar

Other reports suggest that another TFG force is approaching Wanla-weyn in Lower Shabelle. Transitional Federal Government forces are thus reportedly marching towards Mogadishu from at least two directions. However, they are still facing stiff resistance from UIC militias and their allies in several areas. Fighting between the two sides is also continuing in the central Mudug and Galgudud regions of the country. At the same time, the Transitional Federal Government has announced the closure of Somalia's international borders on security grounds and has called on the international community, particularly the neighbouring States, to help enforce that ban.

As the fighting spreads, both sides accuse each other of getting military support from foreign forces. There have been consistent reports of the presence of troops from Ethiopia inside Somalia and their involvement, together with heavy artillery and aircraft, in the fighting on the side of the Transitional Federal Government. Both Mogadishu airport and a military airfield in Baledugle have been subjected to Ethiopian air strikes. Reports have also mentioned the presence of Eritrea on the side of the Union of Islamic Courts, although Eritrea has consistently denied the presence of its troops inside Somalia.

On 23 December, leaders of the Union of Islamic Courts issued a call for jihad against the Ethiopian troops, whom they accused of invading Somalia, and appealed to foreign fighters to join that jihad. The Ethiopian Government, on 24 December, admitted the presence of its combat troops inside Somalia. In an official statement, Prime Minister Meles Zenawi declared that his country had "taken self-defensive measures and started counter-attacking the aggressive extremist forces of the Islamic Courts and foreign terrorist groups".

Civilians have been caught up in the fighting, with reports of several deaths and injuries. Some 760 war-wounded have been officially registered by the International Committee of the Red Cross in hospitals in southern Somalia. The International Committee of the Red Cross has provided war-wound kits for 1,500 patients and plans to distribute additional kits in Baidoa and Mogadishu, subject to security guarantees by the Transitional Federal Government.

The outbreak of fighting has severely undermined the provision of relief assistance to two million conflict- and flood-affected people in south-central Somalia. All United Nations and non-governmental organization international staff have been evacuated, including the United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination Team, which was deployed in response to the flood emergency. Two helicopters used for the flood response have been relocated to Lamu, Kenya.

Internal displacement has been localized, with people moving within districts, seeking clan protection. Reportedly up to half the population of Beletwyne has fled the town. Large-scale movements are reported towards Galkayo in the North and Kismayo in the South. However, numbers have not yet been verified. Kenya is already hosting 35,000 new Somali refugees. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is planning to meet with the Kenyan authorities tomorrow to discuss planning for an additional refugee camp in northern Kenya. Humanitarian agencies have received reports from young men fleeing Mogadishu that children are being forcibly recruited into fighting forces.

Security and access permitting, United Nations agencies and partner non-governmental organizations will attempt to build on the ongoing flood response to deliver assistance to new internally displaced persons and conflict-affected populations through national staff and local non-governmental organizations.

In a statement issued on 22 December, the Secretary-General strongly deplored the outbreak of fighting between the forces of the Transitional Federal Government and the Union of Islamic Courts. He expressed concern at the escalation of conflict in Somalia and its disastrous consequences for civilians, who are already suffering from the effects of years of instability and deprivation, compounded by the recent flooding. He called on the two sides to cease the hostilities immediately and to resume the peace talks initiated in Khartoum without delay and without any preconditions. The Secretary-General also expressed grave concern at the continuous reports of the involvement of foreign forces in the current conflict, and he implored all involved to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Somalia. He urged all the countries of the region to do whatever they could to ensure that the parties return to the peace talks and pursue a negotiated settlement of the crisis.

On 26 December, the Secretary-General called the Prime Minister of Ethiopia and the President of

Kenya. He urged a cessation of hostilities in Somalia and reaffirmed that there is no military solution to the conflict. He also reiterated to the two leaders the need to encourage the Somali parties to resume peace talks without preconditions.

The League of Arab States has also issued an appeal, calling on the Somali parties to resume talks in Khartoum without any preconditions. The Chairperson of the African Union Commission, Mr. Alpha Oumar Konaré, expressed grave concern at the ongoing fighting in Somalia and reiterated his appeal for an immediate ceasefire. He also appealed to the Transitional Federal Government and the Union of Islamic Courts to resume peace talks in Khartoum without preconditions, under the auspices of the Arab League and IGAD. Mr. Konaré called for a meeting of the Arab League, IGAD and the African Union, which is scheduled for 27 December 2006 in Addis Ababa.

As the crisis escalated, I and other members of the international community have intensified our contacts with the two parties, encouraging them to avoid conflict and return to the negotiating table. In this regard, I visited Baidoa on 20 November and appealed to the Transitional Federal Government to maintain the unity of the Transitional Federal Institutions. This unity was undermined when differences emerged over what the Transitional Federal Government regarded as the unilateral decision of the Speaker of the Transitional Federal Parliament to visit Mogadishu to revive the dialogue. The Transitional Federal Government gave me assurances that it would heed my requests. On 4 December, I visited Mogadishu and met with the top leadership of the Union of Islamic Courts and appealed to them to return to dialogue without preconditions and to halt their military expansion. The leaders of the Islamic Courts said that they would give serious consideration to my requests. They also denied that they were harbouring international terrorist suspects and reiterated their invitation for an international fact-finding mission to visit Somalia and verify their claim. Nevertheless, in spite of my appeals to halt their expansion, militias of the Union of Islamic Courts moved unopposed into the town of Dinsor, 60 kilometres from Baidoa, on 5 December.

On 14 December, on the margins of the Second Summit of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, held in Nairobi, I had contacts with a number of regional leaders on the situation in Somalia, as well as with Mr. Alpha Oumar Konaré, Chairperson of the African Union Commission. I also held meetings with senior representatives of a number of diplomatic missions in Nairobi on the implementation of resolution 1725 (2006).

On 19 December, the International Contact Group on Somalia met at the ambassadorial level in Nairobi to discuss the worsening situation on the ground. The Contact Group issued a statement calling on both parties to avoid further escalation through their statements, military action or expansion, and to resume direct talks without preconditions. In the statement, the International Contact Group also expressed its grave concern at the dire humanitarian situation in Somalia and reiterated the need for the parties to guarantee active support and unhindered access for humanitarian assistance.

On 20 December, Mr. Louis Michel, the European Union Commissioner for Humanitarian and Development Aid, visited Baidoa and Mogadishu and urged both parties to avoid conflict and resume dialogue. He also discussed the possibility of establishing the joint verification mechanism discussed during previous rounds of Khartoum talks. Mr. Louis Michel also presented the two sides with a draft memorandum of understanding on avoiding conflict and resuming dialogue, which has not been accepted by the two sides.

While neither side has completely rejected a return to dialogue, it has so far not been possible to reconcile the preconditions introduced by both parties for the resumption of the talks. It should be recalled that disagreements on various preconditions between the delegations of the Transitional Federal Government and the Islamic Courts resulted in the postponement of the third round of Khartoum talks in October.

I would like to conclude my briefing by urging Council members to call on the two sides to halt the fighting immediately and not to take any further provocative actions. All sides to the Somali conflict must also be urged to abide by the provisions of resolution 1725 (2006) and urgently return to dialogue, without preconditions. Unless a political settlement is reached through negotiations, Somalia, I am afraid, will face a period of deepening conflict and heightened instability, which would be disastrous for the long-suffering people of Somalia and could also have serious consequences for the entire region.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank Mr. Fall for his statement.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. I invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion of the subject.

The meeting rose at 3.30 p.m.